

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

I. Introduction:

Claims 12 and 17 are amended and claims 19-20 are added herein. With entry of this amendment, claims 1-20 will be pending.

II. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 112:

Claims 12 and 17 have been amended to clarify that a stored network element dependent module is utilized if the specific type and software version of the network element are compatible with the specific type and software version of another network element on the network. As amended, claims 12 and 17 are believed to comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112.

III. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 102:

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-10, 13-15, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,961,595 (Kawagoe et al.).

Kawagoe et al. do not disclose a network element independent module that includes functions for managing different types of network elements; a network element dependent module that includes functions for managing a specific type of network element; or a network management application that calls the functions of the network element independent and dependent modules to manage a plurality of network elements in a network, as set forth in the claims.

The Kawagoe et al. patent is directed to a network management system with a hardware resource management module shared between networks. The invention converts a message to be exchanged in an interface between an agent and a resource manager into the message capable of conforming with the form of an operation request

standardized by a standard protocol. The primary object of the invention is to provide a network management system configured to decrease labor in developing a protocol converting program for an agent and standardizing a general message format.

Applicants' invention is particularly advantageous in that it allows for new features and new network elements to be readily managed by a network management application. The network element dependent module can provide specifications and functions that are specific to the network element to which the network element dependent module is associated. The network management application can utilize network element independent modules for functions that are generic to the network element type, and network element dependent modules for functions that are specific to the network element type. In this manner, a new network element can be added to a network and readily managed by the network management application regardless of whether the network element includes new features or is a new network element. Conventional techniques, such as those disclosed in Kawagoe et al., require a network management application to be updated in order for the application to manage the new features of a network element.

In rejecting the claims, the Examiner refers to col. 6, lines 9-61 of the Kawagoe et al. patent. This section of the patent discusses how a message converter converts the details of the operation request from the message format of the standard interface to the specification of another interface. If an operation request from a manager needs to modify an instance stored in a database managed by the resource manager, the agent sends the operation request to the message converter. The message converter simply converts the message according to the standard protocol into the message of original format. There is no disclosure of two network element modules; one that includes functions for managing different types of network elements and another that includes functions for managing a specific type of network element, as set forth in the claims. Furthermore, there is no disclosure of a network management application that calls the functions of the network element independent and dependent modules to manage different network elements. In contrast to applicants' invention, Kawagoe et al. provide

an agent having a message converter which is provided to convert messages that are exchanged between an agent and a resource manager. As such, Kawagoe et al. are concerned with the message format of an operation request rather than the type of network element that is sending the request.

Accordingly, claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-10, 13-15, and 18 are submitted as patentable over Kawagoe et al. Claims 2-4 and 19-20, depending from claim 1, claims 6-8, depending from claim 5, claims 10-13, depending from claim 9, and claims 15-18, depending from claim 14, are submitted as patentable for at least the reasons discussed above.

Claims 2 and 6 are further submitted as patentable over Kawagoe et al. because they do not disclose functions of a module that are executable at run time through dynamic class loading.

As to claims 3 and 7, Kawagoe et al. do not disclose a network element dependent module that includes specifications of the network element. First, the Examiner has not pointed out what element of Kawagoe et al. is considered a network element dependent module. Even if, for the sake of discussion, the agent or message converter is considered a network element dependent module, these components do not include specifications of the network element. As previously discussed, the agent and message converter are only concerned with the format of an operation request and do not include specifications of a network element.

Claims 10 and 15 are further submitted as patentable over Kawagoe et al. because they do not disclose sending a request to a network element for the specific type of the network element.

IV. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 103:

Claims 4, 8, 11-12, and 16-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawagoe et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,473,783 (Goshey et al.). Goshey et al. disclose a method and apparatus for sharing peripheral devices over a

network. As shown in Figure 3B, a graphical user interface is provided for use with a setup wizard. Figures 3F and 3G show computer screens that may be used to modify sharing and use rights of particular clients. Goshey et al. do not remedy the deficiencies of the primary reference. Furthermore, Goshey et al. do not show or suggest sending a request to a network element for the software version. Fig. 3C simply shows a window displaying devices that are physically connected to the computer and whether sharing is allowed and the clients are in use.

Accordingly, claims 4, 8, 11-12, and 16-17 are submitted as nonobvious over Kawagoe et al. and Goshey et al.

V. Conclusion:

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants believe that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and should be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would in any way expedite the prosecution of the application, please do not hesitate to call the undersigned at (408) 399-5608.

Respectfully submitted,



Cindy S. Kaplan
Reg. No. 40,043

P.O. Box 2448
Saratoga, CA 95070
Tel: 408-399-5608
Fax: 408-399-5609